



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,279	02/24/2004	Mark Banister	MEDIPACS 04.02	2485
27667	7590	07/17/2008		
HAYES SOLOWAY P.C. 3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE, SUITE 140 TUCSON, AZ 85718				
EXAMINER				
BARTON, JEFFREY THOMAS				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1795				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/786,279

Applicant(s)

BANISTER, MARK

Examiner

Jeffrey T. Barton

Art Unit

1795

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 14-33 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 14-33, and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submissions filed on 17 January 2008 and 18 April 2008 have been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed on 18 April 2008 does not place the application in condition for allowance.

Status of Rejections Pending Since the Office Action of 14 September 2007

3. The previous rejection is withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1795

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-33, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murasko et al (US 2002/0159245) in view of Yamamura (JP 62-106671 with English Abstract) and Curtin. (US 6,160,215)

Regarding claim 1, Murasko et al teaches a fully contained solar powered laminated electrical tape illuminated device comprising stacked layers including a substrate 202 that can be glass or plastic, i.e., rigid or flexible; a photocell 208 (i.e., a photovoltaic that is illuminated by the sun); a device 204, such as a thin film battery, for storing electricity produced by the photocell 208; a source of illumination 206; electrical

Art Unit: 1795

circuitry 214 for connecting the components; and, as a protective surface, a light transmissive, electrically insulating material (see paragraphs 0023 to 0025). This laminated system reads on a "tape" in that Murasko discloses adhesive backing for these devices. (Paragraph 0028)

Regarding claim 2, Murasko discloses a rigid base sealing layer (Paragraph 0025; e.g. glass and plexiglass)

Regarding claim 3, Murasko discloses a flexible base sealing layer. (Paragraphs 0025 and 0026; plastic or cardboard)

Regarding claim 6, the substrate of Murasko inherently has a finite thermal conductivity, and will dissipate heat at a corresponding rate. The structure inherently meets the limitations of this claim.

Regarding claims 7-9, Murasko discloses light-sensing switches (Paragraph 0027), which sense ambient light levels, and actuate a switch operable to turn the lamp on or off. Such switches read on the claims.

Regarding claim 11, it is the Examiner's position that the electrical circuitry in Murasko et al's device inherently prevents electric current drain through the photocell.

Regarding claim 14, Murasko discloses a transparent front electrode of the EL lamp. (Paragraph 0027)

Regarding claim 15, Murasko discloses transparent non-electrical layers. (Paragraph 0025, "light-transmissive" coatings)

Regarding claim 17, Murasko's electroluminescent lamp emits electromagnetic radiation having a frequency, which reads on the claim.

Regarding claims 18-21 and 36, Murasko discloses the electroluminescent lamp comprising an organic light emitting diode. (Paragraph 0021)

Regarding claim 22, any material that transmits light and has a refractive index other than 1 reads on this claim. The glass disclosed in paragraph 0025 meets this limitation.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, a metallic substrate, as disclosed in paragraph 0025 would be reflective, and oriented to reflect light through the opposite surface of the device.

Regarding claims 25 and 26, the organic polymers listed in paragraph 0021 are fluorescent and luminescent.

Regarding claim 27, glass is a dielectric (Paragraph 0025).

Regarding claims 28 and 29, glass is smooth, while cardboard is textured.
(Paragraph 0025)

Regarding claim 30, leads 214 (Paragraph 27) are electrodes on the electroluminescent device, contacts to the power supply, and connection between both, meeting the limitations of the claim.

Regarding claim 33, Murasko discloses using plural devices to provide a signal.
(Paragraph 0028)

Relevant to claims 5, 10, 31, and 32, Murasko et al teaches using the laminated devices for signs, billboards, or other illuminated designs or images. (Paragraph 0028)
In a different embodiment, the reference also teaches signal receivers/transmitters as claimed (Paragraph 0036; microprocessor control) and a second EL lamp connected to

the power supply, which can be illuminated at different times than the first lamp.
(Paragraph 0037) Such a second lamp requires a separate, alternative power outlet (i.e. from battery) and inlet (i.e. to second EL lamp) as required by claim 5.

Murasko et al also teach using an adhesive on the protective surface or base sealing layer to affix the devices onto surfaces. (Paragraph 0028)

Regarding claim 1, Murasko et al do not explicitly teach a removable covering over the adhesive, nor do they explicitly teach the thin film solar cell overlying the thin film battery. Regarding claim 16, Murasko et al do not teach a clear adhesive. Within the cited embodiment of Figure 2, Murasko et al does not explicitly disclose an alternative power inlet and outlet as claimed in claim 5, the transmitters and receivers claimed in claim 10, or the edge to edge assembly/lamination required by claims 31 and 32.

Curtin teaches providing solar cells having an adhesive layer over an outer protective surface, and a removable backing over a clear adhesive layer that allows the cell to be affixed to any desired substrate. (Figure 6; Abstract; Column 4, lines 16-19)

Yamamura et al teaches reduction in the number of parts of a laminated solar battery device and simplified assembly achieved by disposing a charge storage device (Capacitor) on the non-light receiving surface of a thin-film solar cell assembly. (Constitution section of Abstract; Figure 1)

Regarding claim 1, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Murasko et al by including a removable backing on the adhesive layer, as taught by Curtin, because a skilled artisan would have recognized the advantage of such a backing in that it allows easier handling of the devices prior to affixing on a surface. (i.e. no adhesion until desired, no need to apply an adhesive immediately prior to mounting)

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the device of Murasko et al by disposing the thin film charge storage device on the non-light receiving surface of the thin film solar cell, as taught by Yamamura, because Yamamura teaches that such a design reduces the number of parts required and simplifies the assembly of the device. (Purpose section)

Specific to claim 16, it would also have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a clear adhesive, as taught by Curtin, because it would allow adhesion of the device on the interior side of windows and the like, increasing the protection of the devices from damage while still allowing light to reach the solar cell and the light from the EL lamps to be visible from the exterior.

Regarding claim 5, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of the embodiment of Figure 2 of Murasko by connecting a second lamp to a battery, as taught in Paragraph 0037 of Murasko, because it would increase the illumination provided by the system and enable

Art Unit: 1795

a wider variety of display designs powered by a single cell/battery unit. Such a system would have lower manufacturing costs than two lamps powered by separate cell/battery units, providing additional motivation for such an arrangement.

Regarding claim 10, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of the embodiment of Figure 2 of Murasko by using a computer to control the illumination performed by the system, because this would enable desirable complex illumination patterns, such as those described in paragraph 0036, for creative and attractive displays.

Regarding claims 31 and 32, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place plural adhesive devices of the embodiment of Figure 2 of Murasko adjacent each other in making a sign, billboard or other display design, depending on what shape or design is desired. Adjacent placement of these devices reads on the limitations of these claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey T. Barton whose telephone number is (571)272-1307. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

Art Unit: 1795

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey T. Barton/
JTB
16 July 2008